

Matthew R. Bainer, Esq. (SBN 220972)
THE BAINER LAW FIRM
1901 Harrison St., Suite 1100
Oakland, California 94612
Telephone: (510) 922-1802
Facsimile: (510) 844-7701
mbainer@bainerlawfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
(additional counsel listed on following page)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JOSHUA GARCIA, SERA GARCIA, RAYMOND SANDOVAL, KELLY SMITH, AND JENNIFER WILSON, individually, and on behalf of other members of the general public similarly situated, and as aggrieved employees pursuant to the Private Attorneys General Act (“PAGA”),

Plaintiffs,

VS.

HMS HOST, USA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 17-cv-03069-RS

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS ACTION
SETTLEMENT; MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Date: June 6, 2019
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Courtroom: 3

1 NICHOLAS J. SCARDIGLI SBN 249947
 2 WILLIAM J. GORHAM III SBN 151773
 3 ROBERT J. WASSERMAN SBN 258538
 4 JOHN P. BRISCOE SBN 273690
MAYALL HURLEY
 5 A Professional Corporation
 2453 Grand Canal Boulevard
 6 Stockton, California 95207
 Telephone (209) 477-3833
 Facsimile (209) 473-4818

7 MATTHEW J. MATERN, SBN 159798
 8 MATTHEW W. GORDON, SBN 267971
 9 BRAUNSON C. VIRJEE, SBN 295325
MATERN LAW GROUP, PC
 10 1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 200
 Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
 Telephone: 310.531.1900
 Facsimile: 310.531.1901
 11 Emails: [mmatern@maternlawgroup.com](mailto:matern@maternlawgroup.com)
mgordon@maternlawgroup.com

12 KASHIF HAQUE, SBN 218672
 13 SAMUEL A. WONG, SBN 217104
 14 JESSICA L. CAMPBELL, SBN 280626
 SHELLY SONG, SBN 312036
AEGIS LAW FIRM, PC
 15 9811 Irvine Center Drive, Suite 100
 Irvine, California 92618
 Telephone: 949.379.6250
 Facsimile: 949.379.6251

16 TODD M. FRIEDMAN, SBN 216752
 17 ADRIAN R. BACON, SBN 280332
LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.
 18 21550 Oxnard Street, Suite 780
 19 Woodland Hills, CA 91367
 Telephone: 877.206.4741
 20 Facsimile: 866.633.0228
 Email: tfriedman@toddflaw.com
abacon@toddflaw.com

21 Margaret Rosenthal, SBN 147501
 22 Shareef Farag, SBN 251650
 23 Nicholas D. Popper, SBN 293900
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
 24 11601 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1400
 Los Angeles, CA 90025-0509
 Telephone: 310.820.8800
 Facsimile: 310.820.8859
 Email: mrosenthal@bakerlaw.com
sfarag@bakerlaw.com
npopper@bakerlaw.com

1 **TO THE HONORABLE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on June 6, 2019 at 1:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as counsel
3 may be heard, in Courtroom 3 of the above-captioned court, located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San
4 Francisco, CA 94102, the honorable Richard Seeborg presiding, Plaintiffs will, and hereby do, move this
5 Court for entry of an order and judgment granting final approval of the class action settlement and all
6 agreed-upon terms therein. This Motion, unopposed by Defendant Host International, Inc., seeks final
7 approval of: (1) the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release; (2) settlement payments to
8 Participating Class Members; and (3) and costs/expenses to the settlement administrator, CPT Group,
9 Inc.

10 This Motion is based upon: (1) this Notice of Motion and Motion; (2) the Memorandum of
11 Points and Authorities in Support of Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement; (3) the
12 Declaration of Matthew Bainer; (4) the Declaration of John P. Briscoe; (5) the [Proposed] Order Granting
13 Final Approval of the Class Action Settlement and Judgment; (6) the records, pleadings, and papers filed
14 in this action; and (7) upon such other documentary and/or oral evidence as may be presented to the
15 Court at the hearing.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	II.	FACTS AND PROCEDURE	2
3	A.	Brief Overview of the Litigation.....	2
4	B.	Plaintiffs Actively Engaged in the Discovery Process	2
5	C.	The Parties Settled After a Full Day of Arm's Length Negotiations at a Private	
6		Mediation.....	3
7	D.	The Proposed Settlement Fully Resolves Plaintiffs' Claims	4
8	1.	Composition of the Settlement Class.....	5
9	2.	Settlement Consideration.....	5
10	3.	Formula for Calculating Settlement Payments	5
11	4.	Release by the Settlement Class	7
12	E.	The Notice and Settlement Administration Process Were Completed Pursuant to the	
13		Court Order	7
14	III.	ARGUMENT.....	8
15	A.	The Standard for Final Approval Has Been Met.....	8
16	B.	The Settlement Was Achieved After Evaluating the Strengths of Plaintiffs' Case and	
17		the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation.....	10
18	C.	The Settlement Was Reached through Arm's-Length Bargaining in Which All Parties	
19		Were Represented by Experienced Counsel.....	12
20	D.	The Settlement Was Negotiated after Plaintiffs' Counsel Conducted a Thorough	
21		Investigation of the Factual and Legal Issues	12
22	E.	The Settlement Class Has Responded Positively to the Settlement	12
23	F.	The Requested Payment to the Settlement Administrator Is Reasonable and Should	
24		Receive Final Approval.....	13
25	IV.	CONCLUSION	14

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
23 **FEDERAL CASES**

4	<i>Blackwell v. Skywest Airlines, Inc.</i> , 245 F.R.D. 453 (S.D. Cal. 2007).....	10
5	<i>Brown v. Fed. Express Corp.</i> , 249 F.R.D. 580 (C.D. Cal. 2008)	10
6	<i>Churchill Village, LLC v. General Electric</i> , 361 F.3d 566 (9th Cir. 2004).....	12
7	<i>D'Amato v. Deutsche Bank</i> , 236 F.3d 78, 85 (2d Cir. 2001)	11
8	<i>Gonzalez v. Officemax N. Am.</i> , 2012 WL 5473764 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2012)	10
9	<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)	8
10	<i>Hopson v. Hanesbrands Inc.</i> , Case No. 08-00844, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33900 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2009).....	13
11	<i>In re Apple Computer, Inc. Derivative Litig.</i> , No. C 06-4128 JF (HRL), 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108195 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2008)	11
12	<i>In re Atmel Corp. Derivative Litig.</i> , No. C 06-4592 JF (HRL), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145551 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2008).....	11
13	<i>Jimenez v. Allstate Ins. Co.</i> , 2012 WL 1366052 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 18, 2012)	10
14	<i>Kenny v. Supercuts, Inc.</i> , 252 F.R.D. 641 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	10
15	<i>Molski v. Gleich</i> , 318 F.3d 937 (9th Cir. 2003).....	8
16	<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Serv. Comm'n</i> , 688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982)	8
17	<i>Ordonez v. Radio Shack, Inc.</i> , 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7868 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 17, 2013)	10
18	<i>Rodriguez v. West Publ'g Corp.</i> , 563 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2009).....	8

22
23 **STATE CASES**

24	<i>7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland Corp.</i> , 85 Cal. App. 4th 1135 (2000)	12
25	<i>Aguiar v. Cintas Corp. No. 2</i> , 144 Cal. App. 4th 121 (2006).....	9
26	<i>Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Super. Ct.</i> , 53 Cal. 4th 1004 (2012).....	9
27	<i>Gentry v. Super. Ct. (Circuit City Stores)</i> , 42 Cal. 4th 443 (2007)	9

1	<i>Jaimez v. Daiohs USA, Inc.</i> , 181 Cal. App. 4th 1286 (2010).....	9
2	<i>Nordstrom Com. Cases</i> , 186 Cal. App. 4th 576 (2010).....	13
3	<i>Richmond v. Dart Industries, Inc.</i> , 29 Cal. 3d 462 (1981).....	9
4	<i>Sav-On Drug Stores, Inc. v. Super. Ct. (Rocher)</i> , 34 Cal. 4th 319 (2004)	9
5	<i>Smith v. Super. Ct.</i> , 39 Cal. 4th 77 (2006)	9
6		

7 **FEDERAL STATUTES**

8	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(e).....	7
9		

10 **SECONDARY AUTHORITIES**

11	Manual for Complex Litigation (4th ed. 2004).....	7, 8
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

INTRODUCTION

On January 29, 2019, the Court granted preliminary approval of the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release¹ and approved distribution of the Notice of Class Action Settlement (“Class Notice”) to all Class Members. Class Members were given 30 days to submit Requests for Exclusion or objections to the Settlement (“Response Deadline”). As of the date of this filing, Plaintiffs are pleased to report that: (1) not a single Class Member objected to the Settlement; (2) only 3 Class Member has opted out of the Settlement Class; and (3) the average payment to Participating Class Members is expected to be approximately \$168.11, and the highest is approximately \$1046.86. (Declaration of Chris Pinkus [“Pinkus Decl.”] ¶ 16)

Plaintiffs now seek final approval of this Settlement with Defendant Host International, Inc., (“Defendant” or “Host”) (collectively with Plaintiffs, the “Parties”). Defendant does not oppose this Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement. The basic terms of the Settlement provide for the following:

- (1) A Settlement Class defined as: non-exempt employees of Defendant in California at any time from April 25, 2013 through January 29, 2019.
- (2) A Class Settlement Amount of \$2,200,000. The Class Settlement Amount includes:
 - (a) A Net Settlement Amount of approximately \$1,350,629.64 (\$2,200,000 of the Class Settlement Amount minus the requested Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Settlement Administration Costs, requested Class Representative Enhancement Payments and payment to the LWDA), which will be allocated to participating Class Members on a pro-rata basis according to their dates of employment and the number of weeks that each Class Member worked during the Class Period ;
 - (b) Attorneys' fees of up to one-third of the Class Settlement Amount, or \$733,333, and \$38,037.36 for litigation costs and expenses;
 - (c) Settlement Administration Costs of \$35,000, to be paid to the jointly selected class action settlement administrator Rust Consulting ("Rust")²;

¹ Hereinafter, "Settlement" or "Settlement Agreement." Unless indicated otherwise, all capitalized terms used herein have the same meaning as those defined by the Settlement Agreement.

² See Exhibit "A" to Bainer Decl.

1 (d) Class Representative Enhancement Payments of up to \$5,000 each to Plaintiffs
 2 Joshua Garcia, Sera Garcia, Kelly Smith and Jennifer Wilson and up to \$8,000 to
 3 Plaintiff Raymond Sandoval.
 4 (e) A payment to the LWDA pursuant to the Private Attorney General Act of
 5 \$15,000.

6 An objective evaluation of the Settlement confirms that the relief negotiated on the class' behalf is
 7 fair, reasonable, and valuable. The Parties negotiated the Settlement at arm's length with guidance from
 8 experienced class action employment mediator David A. Rotman, Esq.. The relief offered by the
 9 Settlement is particularly notable when viewed against the difficulties encountered by plaintiffs pursuing
 10 wage and hour cases (*see infra*). Indeed, the proposed relief is arguably superior to the relief that the class
 11 might have obtained after additional costly litigation because by settling now, rather than proceeding to
 12 trial, Class Members will not have to wait (possibly years) for relief, nor will they have to bear the risk of
 13 class certification being denied or of Defendants prevailing at trial.

14 Accordingly, given the Settlement's favorable terms and the manner in which these terms were
 15 negotiated and received by Class Members, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant this
 16 Motion for Final Approval of the Settlement Agreement and retain jurisdiction to enforce the Settlement.

17 **I. FACTS AND PROCEDURE**

18 **A. Brief Overview of the Litigation**

19 This Settlement provides for the global resolution of this action and four related actions. Three of
 20 those actions, *Kelly Smith v. Host International Inc.*, Fresno County Superior Court Case No.
 21 17CECG03397; *Jennifer Wilson v. Host International, Inc.*, et al., Los Angeles County Superior Court
 22 Case No. BC684110 and *Sera Garcia v. Host International, Inc.*, et al., San Diego County Superior Court
 23 Case No. 37-2017-00046403 brought causes of action based primarily on, and overlapping with the causes
 24 of action and theories of recovery plead herein. All three of the *Smith*, *Wilson* and *Garcia* actions were
 25 stipulated to be stayed pending the resolution of this action. (Bainer Decl. ¶2) The fourth related action,
 26 *Sandoval v. Host International, Inc.* Fresno County Superior Court Case No. 17CECG00374 ("*Sandoval*")
 27 was filed and litigated independently of this action for a single cause of action for Failure to Provide
 28 Itemized Wage Statements pursuant to Cal. Labor Code § 226. (Briscoe Decl. ¶¶ 1-3)

1 Following a global mediation on March 15, 2018 and subsequently resulting global settlement
 2 agreement, discussed *infra*, the parties to this action and all related cases agreed to seek leave to amend the
 3 Complaint herein to add all parties to the related action, and all causes of action brought thereby, to this
 4 action such that approval of the global settlement agreement could be sought in one proceeding in front of
 5 this Court. On November 26, 2018 this Court issued its order granting Plaintiffs leave to file their Second
 6 Amended Complaint. That pleading adds all parties to the settlement as parties to this action and alleges
 7 violations of (1) unpaid overtime (both under California state and federal statutes); (2) unpaid minimum
 8 wages; (3) failure to provide meal periods; (4) failure to authorize and permit rest periods; (5) failure to
 9 timely pay wages; (6) failure to pay reporting time pay; (7) failure to indemnify for incurred business
 10 expenses; (8) failure to provide accurate wage statements; (9) failure to maintain required business records;
 11 (10) the Private Attorney General Act and (11) unfair competition.

12 Plaintiffs' claims flow from the following core factual allegations:

- 13 • Host did not maintain accurate records or provide accurate wage statements to its
 employees.
- 14 • Host did not consistently provide non-exempt employees with a timely meal or rest
 breaks, as required under California Law.
- 15 • Host required employees to perform additional work tasks while off-the-clock, incur
 unreimbursed business expenses and sent employees home without pay when those
 employees reported to their assigned post, all resulting in unpaid work time.
- 16 • As a derivative result of the above allegations, Host failed to pay all terminated employees
 the correct amount of wages earned.

21 **B. Plaintiffs Actively Engaged in the Discovery Process**

22 Plaintiffs have conducted sufficient investigation and discovery in the Action in order to assess the
 23 merits and risks of the proceeding to trial with the claims brought herein, and the adequacy and fairness of
 24 this Settlement in light thereof. For example, both parties to this action exchanged Initial Disclosures
 25 pursuant to F.R.C.P. Rule 26. Additionally, Plaintiffs in both this action and the related *Sandoval* lawsuit
 26 served, and Defendant responded to, written discovery in the form of both Special interrogatories and
 27 Requests for Documents. Plaintiffs subsequently met and conferred repeatedly regarding the scope of
 28

1 Defendant's production and responses and additional information to be provided. In response to this
 2 discovery, Defendant produced policy documents, handbooks, wage and hour records, and thousands of
 3 pages of class member time records. Additionally, in support of the Parties' settlement negotiations and
 4 mediation session, Defendant provided data and information regarding the average hourly rate of pay for
 5 Class Members, the total approximate number of Class Members who worked during the Class Period, the
 6 total number of former employees during the Class Period and the total number of workweeks worked by
 7 Class Members during the Class Period. (See, Bainer Decl. ¶ 3; Briscoe Decl. ¶ 4)

8 Additionally, Plaintiffs' Counsel performed an extensive independent investigation into the claims
 9 at issue, including (1) determining the suitability of the putative class representatives through interviews,
 10 background investigations, and analyses of employment files and related records; (2) researching wage-
 11 and-hour class actions involving similar claims; (3) acquiring information regarding putative Class
 12 Members' potential claims, identifying additional witnesses, and obtaining documents in support of
 13 Plaintiffs' eventual Motion for Class Certification; (4) obtaining and analyzing Defendant's wage-and-hour
 14 policies and procedures; (5) researching the latest case law developments bearing on the theories of
 15 liability; (6) researching settlements in similar cases; (7) preparing valuation analyses of claims; (8)
 16 participating in a full-day private mediation session and preparing related memoranda; (9) negotiating the
 17 terms of this Settlement; (10) finalizing the Joint Stipulation of Class Action Settlement and Release; and
 18 (11) and drafting preliminary and final approval papers. The document and data exchanges allowed
 19 Plaintiffs' Counsel to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the claims against Defendant and the benefits
 20 of the proposed Settlement. (See, Bainer Decl. ¶ 4; Briscoe Decl. ¶ 4)

21 **C. The Parties Settled After a Full Day of Arm's Length Negotiations at a Private
 22 Mediation**

23 After exchanging documents and conducting preliminary settlement discussions, the parties
 24 attended a mediation with David A. Rotman, Esq., who specializes in mediating employment disputes,
 25 including wage and hour class actions. As a result of the mediation, the parties were able to reach an
 26 agreement on the principal terms of settlement. The parties continued to discuss and negotiate the
 27 remaining details over the course of several months. At all times, the Parties' negotiations were adversarial
 28

1 and non-collusive. The Settlement therefore constitutes a fair, adequate, and reasonable compromise of the
 2 claims at issue. (Bainer Decl. ¶ 5; Briscoe Decl. ¶¶ 9-12.)

3 **D. The Proposed Settlement Fully Resolves Plaintiff's Claims**

4 **1. Composition of the Settlement Class**

5 The proposed Settlement Classes consist of two subclasses. The first class consists of means all
 6 non-exempt employees of Host International, Inc. in California at any time from April 25, 2013 through
 7 January 29, 2019. The second class, which is a sub-class of the larger class and includes only those class
 8 members who were eligible to recover penalties under Cal. Labor Code §§ 226 and 2698 et seq., based on
 9 their dates of employment and the applicable statutory period (one year per Cal. Code Civ. Proc., § 340(a)),
 10 consist of all non-exempt employees of Host International, Inc. in California employed at any time from
 11 February 6, 2016 through January 29, 2019. (Settlement Agreement ¶¶ 1.4 and 1.23)

12 **2. Settlement Consideration**

13 Plaintiffs and Defendant have agreed to settle the underlying class claims in exchange for two
 14 settlement funds in the amount of \$1,500,000 ("Primary Settlement Fund") and \$700,000 ("Wage
 15 Statement Settlement Fund"). The Primary Settlement Fund includes (1) settlement payments to all Class
 16 Members who worked for Defendant between April 25, 2013 through the January 29, 2019, and who does
 17 not opt-out; (2) up to \$500,000 in attorneys' fees; (3) reasonable litigation costs and expenses; (4) 70% of
 18 the Settlement Administration Costs of \$35,000; (5) Class Representative Enhancement Payment of \$5000
 19 to each of Plaintiffs Joshua Garcia, Sera Garcia, Kelly Smith and Jennifer Wilson; and (6) 70% of the
 20 PAGA Payment. (Settlement Agreement ¶1.28) The Wage Statement Settlement Fund includes (1)
 21 settlement payments to all Class Members who worked between February 6, 2016 through the January 29,
 22 2019 and who does not opt-out; (2) up to \$233,333 in attorneys' fees; (3) reasonable litigation costs and
 23 expenses; (4) 30% of the Settlement Administration Costs of approximately \$35,000; (5) Class
 24 Representative Enhancement Payment of \$8,000 to Plaintiff Raymond Sandoval; and (6) 30% of the
 25 PAGA Payment. (Settlement Agreement ¶1.29) A premium is appropriate for Plaintiffs since they were the
 26 lead plaintiffs, actively supported Plaintiffs' Counsel's efforts on behalf of the class and are executing a full
 27 release of claims as part of the Settlement Agreement.

Subject to the Court approving Attorneys' Fees and Costs, Settlement Administration Costs, and the Class Representative Enhancement Payments, the Net Settlement Amounts will be distributed to all eligible Class Members who do not opt-out of the settlement. Because the Class Settlement Amount is non-reversionary, 100% of the Net Settlement Amount, less all employee payroll tax requirements and any other applicable payroll deductions required by law, will be paid to eligible Class Members, and without the need to submit claims for payment.

3. Formula for Calculating Settlement Payments

Each Class Member's share of the Net Settlement Amount will be proportional to the number of weeks he or she worked as a Class Member during the respective Class Period and the Wage Statement Settlement Fund eligible period. (Settlement Agreement ¶6.2) The Settlement Administrator will calculate Individual Settlement Payments as follows:

- Defendant will provide to the Settlement Administrator each Class Member's name, social security number, last known address, telephone number(s), the total number of Workweeks worked during the class period and the total number of Workweeks worked during the Wage Statement Settlement Fund eligible period.
- To determine each Class Member's estimated Individual Settlement Payment, the Settlement Administrator will divide the Net Settlement Amount by the total number of Workweeks for the both the class period and the Wage Statement Settlement Fund sub-class period, resulting in the Net Settlement Workweek Value for each Fund, and then multiplying the Net Settlement Workweek Value by the number of workweeks worked by each Participating Class Member during the Class Period and Wage Statement Settlement Fund sub-class period, respectively.
- The Individual Settlement Payment will be reduced by any required deductions for each Participating Class Member as specifically set forth herein, including employee-side tax withholdings or deductions. Defendant will pay any employer-side tax payments.

There are 8044 Settlement Class Members, so the average net recovery is expected to be \$168.11 and the highest recovery is expected to be \$1,041.86. This average net recovery is significantly higher than many wage and hour class action settlements approved by California state and federal courts.³

³ See, e.g., *Sandoval v. Nissho of Cal., Inc.*, Case No. 37-2009-00091861 (San Diego County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$145); *Fukuchi v. Pizza Hut*, Case No. BC302589 (L.A. County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$120); *Contreras v. United Food Group, LLC*, Case No. BC389253 (L.A. County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$120); *Ressler v. Federated Department Stores, Inc.*, Case No. BC335018 (L.A. County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$90); *Doty v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, Case No. CV05-3241 FMC-JWJx (C.D. Cal. May 14, 2007) (average net recovery of approximately \$65); *Sorenson v. PetSmart, Inc.*, Case No. 2:06-CV-02674-JAM-DAD (E.D. Cal.)

4. Release by the Settlement Class

In exchange for the Class Settlement Amount, Plaintiffs, and Class Members who do not opt out, will release the Released Claims. The Released Claims are those claims within the applicable statute of limitations period (April 25, 2013 through January 29, 2019) “which have been or could have reasonably been alleged in the Lawsuits against the Released Parties” (Settlement Agreement ¶10.1).

E. The Notice and Settlement Administration Process Were Completed Pursuant to the Court Order

As authorized by the Court's Order preliminarily approving the Settlement Agreement, the Parties engaged Rust Consulting, Inc. to provide settlement administration services. (Pinkus Decl. ¶ 3.) CPT Group' duties have and/or will include: a) preparing, printing and mailing the Notice of Class Action Settlement (hereinafter referred to as "Notice Packet"); b) performing a search based on the National Change of Address Database to update and correct any known or identifiable address changes; c) taking appropriate steps to trace, update and locate any Class Member whose address or contact information as provided to the Claims Administrator is inaccurate or outdated; d) establishing and maintaining a toll-free case support hotline where Class Members can speak to case representatives regarding case specific questions; e) receiving and providing to Class Counsel, Defendant's counsel, and the Court, copies of Workweek challenges and opt-out requests; f) providing to Class Counsel and Defendant's counsel a weekly report of the progress and completion of tasks identified in the Agreement; g) providing declaration(s) specifying the due diligence the Claims Administrator took with regard to the mailing of the Notice Packet; h) calculating the total number of workweeks for all Class Members and determining their Individual Settlement Payment amounts; i) calculating Defendant's share of payroll taxes, including FICA and FUTA, on the portion of each Individual Settlement Payment allocated to unpaid wages; j) maintaining prior to disbursement all settlement funds in a qualified settlement fund; k) processing, issuing, and mailing Individual Settlement Payments to Participating Class Members in addition to all proper payments to Plaintiffs, Class Counsel, and relevant tax

(average net recovery of approximately \$60); *Lim v. Victoria's Secret Stores, Inc.*, Case No. 04CC00213 (Orange County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$35); and *Gomez v. Amadeus Salon, Inc.*, Case No. BC392297 (L.A. Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$20).

1 authorities; l) issuing to each Participating Class Member a Form W-2 and a Form 1099 for each
 2 Individual Settlement Payment; and m) completing any associated tax withholding and reporting to the
 3 State and Federal tax authorities. (*Id.*)

4 On February 11, 2019, Rust received the Class Notice prepared jointly by Plaintiffs' Counsel
 5 and counsel for Defendants and approved by the Court. (Pinkus Decl. ¶ 6.) The Class Notice advised
 6 Class Members of their right to submit a request for exclusion from the Settlement, object to the
 7 Settlement or do nothing, and the implications of each such action. The Notice Packet advised Class
 8 Members of applicable deadlines and other events, including the Final Approval Hearing, and how Class
 9 Members could obtain additional information.

10 Separately, counsel for Defendants provided Rust with a mailing list (the "Class List"), which
 11 included each Class Member's full name, last known address, Social Security Numbers, and information
 12 necessary to calculate payments. (*Id.* at ¶ 7.) The mailing addresses contained in the Class List were
 13 processed and updated using the National Change of Address Database maintained by the U.S. Postal
 14 Service. (*Id.* at ¶ 8.) On March 29, 2019, Rust mailed Class Notices to Class Members via First-Class
 15 U.S. mail. (*Id.* at ¶ 9) Plaintiffs are pleased to report that, to-date not a single Class Member has objected
 16 and only three Class Members has requested exclusion from the Settlement. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 14-15.)

17 **III. ARGUMENT**

18 **A. The Standard for Final Approval Has Been Met**

19 A class action may only be settled, dismissed, or compromised with the Court's approval. Fed.
 20 R. Civ. Proc. 23(e). The process for court approval of a class action settlement is comprised of three
 21 principal stages:

22 Preliminary Approval: The proposed settlement agreement is preliminarily reviewed by the
 23 Court for fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness. If the Court believes the settlement falls within the
 24 range of reasonableness, such that proceeding to a formal fairness hearing is warranted, it orders notice
 25 of the settlement disseminated to the class. *See* Manual for Complex Litigation § 21.632 (4th ed. 2004).

26 Class Notice: Notice of the settlement is disseminated to the class, giving class members an
 27 opportunity to object to the settlement's terms or preserve their right to bring an individual action by

1 opting out. *See id.*, § 21.633.

2 Final Approval: A formal fairness or final-approval hearing is held by the Court, at which class
 3 members can be heard regarding the settlement, and at which evidence and argument concerning the
 4 fairness, adequacy, and reasonableness of the settlement is presented.⁴ Following the hearing, the Court
 5 decides whether to approve the settlement and enter a final order and judgment. *See id.*, § 21.634.

6 The first two steps have been completed. The Court has preliminarily reviewed the proposed
 7 settlement for fairness and found it to be within the range of reasonableness meriting court approval.
 8 (See December 13, 2018, Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Class Settlement, Dkt. No. 38.) In
 9 addition, the Settlement Administrator has notified Class Members of the proposed settlement and
 10 upcoming fairness hearing as directed by the Court. (See generally Pinkus Decl.) Plaintiffs now ask the
 11 Court to grant final approval of the proposed settlement.

12 The decision about whether to approve the proposed settlement is committed to the sound
 13 discretion of the trial judge and will not be overturned except upon a strong showing of a clear abuse of
 14 discretion. *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1026-1027. The Ninth Circuit has set forth a list of non-exclusive
 15 factors that a district court should consider in deciding whether to grant final approval, namely: (1) the
 16 strength of plaintiff's case, and the risk, expense, complexity, and likely duration of further litigation; (2)
 17 the risk of maintaining class action status throughout the trial; (3) the amount offered in settlement; (4)
 18 the extent of discovery completed, and the stage of the proceedings; (5) the experience and views of
 19 counsel; and (6) the reaction of the class members to the proposed settlement. *Id.* at 963 (citing *Molski v.*
 20 *Gleich*, 318 F.3d 937, 953 (9th Cir. 2003)).

21 These factors, which are discussed below, confirm that the proposed settlement is more than fair,
 22 reasonable, and adequate for Class Members. The settlement provides considerable value; Class
 23

24 ⁴ A proposed class action settlement may be approved if the Court, after allowing absent class members had an
 25 opportunity to be heard, finds that the settlement is "fair, reasonable, and adequate." In making this determination,
 26 "the court's intrusion upon what is otherwise a private consensual agreement negotiated between the parties to a
 27 lawsuit must be limited to the extent necessary to reach a reasoned judgment that the agreement is not the product
 28 of fraud or overreaching by, or collusion between, the negotiating parties, and that the settlement, taken as a whole,
 is fair, reasonable and adequate to all concerned." *Rodriguez v. West Publ'g Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 965 (9th Cir.
 2009) (quoting *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1020 (9th Cir. 1998)); see also *Officers for Justice v.*
Civil Serv. Comm'n, 688 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982) ("voluntary conciliation and settlement are the preferred
 means of dispute resolution. This is especially true in complex class action litigation").

1 Members need not bear the risk and delay associated with trial proceedings to obtain these benefits; and
 2 the settlement has been met with substantial support and no opposition from Class Members.

3 **B. The Settlement Was Achieved After Evaluating the Strengths of Plaintiff's Case
 4 and the Risks, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation**

5 Plaintiffs evaluated the claims in light of the risks of continued litigation in order to determine a
 6 reasonable range of class relief. Although Plaintiffs believe the class claims are strong, Defendant disputes
 7 liability and the appropriateness of class certification (for all purposes other than settlement) and has
 8 vigorously defended the action. Plaintiffs recognize that if the litigation had continued, thhe may have
 9 encountered significant legal and factual hurdles that could have prevented the Class from obtaining any
 10 recovery. To be sure, a number of cases have found wage and hours actions to be especially amenable to
 11 class resolution.⁵ However, some courts have gone the other way, finding that some of the very claims at
 12 issue here—meal period, rest period, and off-the-clock violations—were not suitable for class adjudication
 13 because they raised too many individualized issues.⁶

14

15 ⁵ See *Brinker Restaurant Corp. v. Super. Ct.*, 53 Cal. 4th 1004, 1033 (2012) (“Claims alleging that a uniform policy
 16 consistently applied to a group of employees is in violation of the wage and hour laws are of the sort routinely, and
 17 properly, found suitable for class treatment . . . The theory of liability – that [the employer] has a uniform policy,
 18 and that that policy, measured against wage order requirements, allegedly violates the law - is by its nature a
 19 common question eminently suited for class treatment.”). Litigation of wage and hour claims on class-wide bases
 20 (1) encourages the vigorous enforcement of wage laws (*Smith v. Super. Ct.*, 39 Cal. 4th 77, 82 (2006)); (2)
 21 “eliminates the possibility of repetitious litigation” (*Sav-on Drug Stores, Inc. v. Super. Ct. (Rocher)*, 34 Cal. 4th
 22 319, 340 (2004)); (3) affords small claimants a method of obtaining redress (*id.*); (4) “deter[s] and redress[es]
 23 alleged wrongdoing” (*Jaimez v. Daiohs USA, Inc.*, 181 Cal. App. 4th 1286, 1298 (2010)); (5) “avoid[s] windfalls to
 24 defendants” (*Brinker*, 53 Cal. 4th at 1054); (6) avoids “inconsistent or varying adjudications” (*Aguiar v. Cintas
 25 Corp. No. 2*, 144 Cal. App. 4th 121, 129 (2006)); and (7) alleviates the concerns of employees about retaliation
 26 (*Gentry v. Super. Ct. (Circuit City Stores)*, 42 Cal. 4th 443, 462-63 (2007); *Jaimez v. Daiohs USA, Inc.*, 181 Cal.
 27 App. 4th at 1308). These policies are so strongly favored that “class certifications should not be denied [in wage
 28 and hour cases] so long as the absent class members’ rights are adequately protected.” *Richmond v. Dart
 Industries, Inc.*, 29 Cal. 3d 462, 474 (1981); see also *Sav-On*, *supra*, 34 Cal. 4th 319 (upholding certification of an
 overtime class action based on a showing that all plaintiffs performed jobs that were highly standardized, and as a
 result, class members performed essentially the same tasks, most of which were non-exempt as a matter of law).

6 See *Duran v. U.S. Bank National Association*, 59 Cal. 4th 1, 31 (2014) (reversing a verdict from a class trial);
Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc., 233 Cal. App. 4th 1065 (2014) (finding that the trial court erred in
 granting summary adjudication and summary judgment to security guards who were on call during rest breaks
 because neither the Labor Code nor the applicable wage order mandated that employees be relieved of all duties
 during rest breaks); *Ali v. U.S.A. Cab Ltd.*, 176 Cal. App. 4th 1333, 1341 (2009) (affirming denial of certification
 because employees’ declarations attesting to having taken meal and rest breaks demonstrated that individualized
 inquiries were required to show harm); *Campbell v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137792, at *30-
 41 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 20, 2013) (following *Brinker* and denying certification of proposed off-the-clock and rest and
 meal break classes due to lack of uniform policy); *Jimenez v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 65328 (C.D.
 Cal. Apr. 18, 2012) (denying motion to certify meal and rest break classes based on employer’s practice of
 understaffing and overworking employees); *Gonzalez v. Officemax N. Am.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 163853 (C.D.
 Cal. Nov. 5, 2012) (same); *Brown v. Fed. Express Corp.*, 249 F.R.D. 580, 587-88 (C.D. Cal. 2008) (denying

1 Some courts have denied certification even when an employer's policies are unlawful on their face.
 2 For instance, in *Ordonez v. Radio Shack, Inc.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7868, *35-41 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 17,
 3 2013), the court denied certification even though the plaintiff submitted evidence of a facially unlawful
 4 policy regarding rest breaks. The *Ordonez* court concluded that the predominance and superiority elements
 5 were not met based on the employer's presentation of anecdotal evidence of lawful compliance
 6 notwithstanding the unlawful policy. *Id.* at *38-40.

7 As the above examples illustrate, the prospect of certifying a wage and hour action is always
 8 uncertain, and the risk of being denied class certification militates in favor of settlement. A denial of class
 9 certification effectively forecloses continued litigation, as neither the individual nor his or her attorney will
 10 have any incentive to proceed with an individual case when such small claims are at stake. *See In re*
 11 *Baycol Cases I & II*, 51 Cal. 4th 751, 758 (2011) (explaining that a dismissal of class claims is effectively
 12 the "death knell" of the case, despite survival of individual claims). In other words, for cases where
 13 individual damages are relatively small, denial of class certification results in a near-complete loss for
 14 Plaintiff as well as no recovery for the employees, who are shut out of the action. Thus, if the putative
 15 Class had not been certified, the value of Plaintiffs' case would have been reduced to a fraction of the value
 16 of this Settlement; indeed, Defendant would have likely offered no money to settle the class-wide claims if
 17 certification had been denied.

18 In summary, although Plaintiffs and their counsel maintain a strong belief in the underlying merits
 19 of the claims, they also acknowledge the significant challenges posed by continued litigation through
 20 certification and/or at the merits stage. Accordingly, when balanced against the risk and expense of
 21 continued litigation, the settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable. *Linney v. Cellular Alaska P'ship*, 151
 22 F.3d 1234, 1242 (9th Cir. 1998) ("the very essence of a settlement is compromise, a yielding of absolutes
 23 and an abandoning of highest hopes").

24
 25
 26 certification of driver meal and rest period claims based on the predominance of individual issues); *Kenny v.*
 27 *Supercuts, Inc.*, 252 F.R.D. 641, 645 (N.D. Cal. 2008) (denying certification on meal periods claim); *Blackwell v.*
 28 *Skywest Airlines, Inc.*, 245 F.R.D. 453, 467-68 (S.D. Cal. 2007) (declining to certify class action because individual
 issues predominated when different employee stations provided different practices with respect to meal periods).

C. The Settlement Was Reached through Arm's-Length Bargaining in Which All Parties Were Represented by Experienced Counsel

3 As discussed above, the Settlement is result of arm's-length negotiations. The Parties participated
4 in both a mandatory settlement conference and a private mediation before experienced class action
5 employment mediator David A. Rotman, Esq. Mr. Rotman helped to manage the Parties' expectations and
6 provided a useful, neutral analysis of the issues and risks to both sides.⁷ The Parties were represented by
7 experienced class action counsel throughout the negotiations resulting in this Settlement. Plaintiffs'
8 Counsel are seasoned in class action litigation and regularly litigate wage and hour claims through
9 certification and on the merits, and have considerable experience settling wage and hour class actions.
10 Defendant was represented by Baker & Hostetler, a nationally respected defense firm.

D. The Settlement Was Negotiated after Plaintiffs' Counsel Conducted a Thorough Investigation of the Factual and Legal Issues

13 As set forth in greater detail above, based on their analysis of documents produced by Defendants,
14 including a representative sample of time and payroll records and relevant policy and operational
15 documents, as well as information provided by Class Members during interviews, Plaintiffs' Counsel were
16 able to realistically assess the value of Plaintiff's claims and intelligently engage defense counsel in
17 settlement discussions that resulted in the proposed settlement now before the Court. (Bainer Decl. ¶¶ 3-5.)
18 By engaging in a thorough investigation and evaluation of Plaintiffs' claims, Plaintiffs' Counsel can
19 knowledgeably opine that the Settlement, for the consideration and on the terms set forth in the Settlement
20 Agreement, is fair, reasonable, and adequate, and is in the best interests of Class Members in light of all
21 known facts and circumstances, including the risk of significant delay and uncertainty associated with
22 litigation and various defenses asserted by Defendant.

E. The Settlement Class Has Responded Positively to the Settlement

²⁴ The Settlement Class' response demonstrates its support for this settlement—to date not a single

⁷ *In re Apple Computer, Inc. Derivative Litig.*, No. C 06-4128 JF (HRL), 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108195 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2008) (mediator’s participation weighs considerably against any inference of a collusive settlement), *In re Atmel Corp. Derivative Litig.*, No. C 06-4592 JF (HRL), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145551 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2008) (same); *D’Amato v. Deutsche Bank*, 236 F.3d 78, 85 (2d Cir. 2001) (a “mediator’s involvement in pre-certification settlement negotiations helps to ensure that the proceedings were free of collusion and undue pressure.”) At all times, the Parties’ negotiations were adversarial and non-collusive.

1 Class Member has objected to, and only 3 Class members have opted out of, the Settlement.
 2 Participating Class Members will share the Net Settlement Amount, and will receive an average
 3 payment of \$168.11 (Pinkus Decl. ¶14-17.) A low number of opt outs and objections is a strong
 4 indicator that a settlement is fair and reasonable. *7-Eleven Owners for Fair Franchising v. Southland*
 5 *Corp.*, 85 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1152-53 (2000) (class response favorable where “[a] mere 80 of the 5,454
 6 national class members elected to opt out [(1.5% of the entire Class)] and . . . [a] total of nine
 7 members . . . objected to the settlement); *Churchill Village, LLC v. General Electric*, 361 F.3d 566 (9th
 8 Cir. 2004) (affirming settlement approval where 45 of approximately 90,000 notified class members
 9 objected and 500 opted out). The Settlement Class’ response compares favorably to those cases and
 10 warrants final approval.

11 Likewise, the average Class Member recovery of \$168.11 compares favorably to other wage and
 12 hour class action settlements for similar claims on behalf of non-exempt employees. *See, e.g., Sandoval*
 13 *v. Nissho of Cal., Inc.*, Case No. 37-2009-00091861 (San Diego County Super. Ct.) (average net
 14 recovery of approximately \$145); *Fukuchi v. Pizza Hut*, Case No. BC302589 (L.A. County Super. Ct.)
 15 (average net recovery of approximately \$120); *Contreras v. United Food Group, LLC*, Case No.
 16 BC389253 (L.A. County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately \$120); *Ressler v. Federated*
 17 *Department Stores, Inc.*, Case No. BC335018 (L.A. County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of
 18 approximately \$90); *Doty v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, Case No. CV05-3241 FMC-JWJx (C.D. Cal. May
 19 14, 2007) (average net recovery of approximately \$65); *Sorenson v. PetSmart, Inc.*, Case No. 2:06-CV-
 20 02674-JAM-DAD (E.D. Cal.) (average net recovery of approximately \$60); *Lim v. Victoria’s Secret*
 21 *Stores, Inc.*, Case No. 04CC00213 (Orange County Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of approximately
 22 \$35); and *Gomez v. Amadeus Salon, Inc.*, Case No. BC392297 (L.A. Super. Ct.) (average net recovery of
 23 approximately \$20).

24 **F. The Requested Payment to the Settlement Administrator Is Reasonable and
 25 Should Receive Final Approval**

26 Plaintiff’s request final approval of claims administration costs in an amount of \$35,000.00.
 27 Rust has promptly and properly distributed the Class Notice to all Class Members and completed its
 28

1 duties in accordance with the settlement terms and the Court's preliminary approval Order. (See
2 generally Pinkus Decl.) Accordingly, the payment is fair and reasonable and should be accorded final
3 approval along with the rest of the Settlement terms.

4 **IV. CONCLUSION**

5 The Parties have negotiated a fair and reasonable settlement of a case that provides relief that
6 likely would never have been realized but for this class action. Accordingly, final approval of the
7 Settlement should be granted.

8

9 Dated: May 2, 2019

THE BAINER LAW FIRM

10

11

By: /s/ Matthew R. Bainer

12

Matthew R. Bainer
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28